

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
						✓					

THE CHRISTIAN.

Vol. III. }

SAINT JOHN, N. B., AUGUST 1847.

{ No. 8.

CONDUCTED BY W. W. EATON.

Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God — *Peter*. On this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. — *The Lord Messiah*.

UNIVERSALISM

Is purely a negative system. Its advocates labor much more to prove their disbelief than their faith. Although it requires some talent and ingenuity to make even a plausible defence of the system, yet it is a very plain one. A few negatives include the whole marrow and fatness of Universalism—"There is no devil; there is no hell; there will be no future judgment; there is no religious distinction among men in this world, and there will be no difference in their condition in the world to come."

Our principal reason for noticing the speculations of this comparatively modern system, is to call attention again to Brother ALEX. HALL's book, written expressly to show how completely suicidal the whole theory is.

By the way I would remark that we have but few professed Universalists in our communities. Five minutes conversation with one of these disclosed, no doubt, the true grounds of a large majority of that class: he began by saying, "I am a Universalist," and almost immediately began to talk about a book he had shewing up the absurdities of the miracles of Christ! A large proportion however of those who have back-slided, from a zealous devotion to some religious society become Universalists. So far as our knowledge extends, we believe that nearly all the pioneers of the theory in America were once members of some "orthodox" sect! But we will not boast of being free from Universalism, for almost every one in the community belongs to some "Church," and they "die in sure and cert in hope of everlasting life!" at least, so says the man of the gown who reads prayers!

We were much pleased, and not a little surprised to read the following account of a CONVERSION FROM UNIVERSALISM, written by Bro. George Campbell, for the *Christian Journal and Union*: "Upon one of the steamboats I became acquainted with Brother William S. Clarke. * * He had been a preacher of the Universalian faith, of excellent reputation both east and west, an author of some published discourses, and put on the list by Mr. Manford as an assistant editor of *The Western Universalist*. Upon entering into religious conversation with him, I found him entirely dissatisfied with Universalism; candid, inquiring, and ready to receive the truth. He was never *ultra* in his views, but a restorationist in principle. As he desired, I set before him the Gospel as I have learned it in God's oracles, and presented it in contrast with the

theories, doctrines and commandments of men. The result is, he has renounced Universalism as a system, embraced the Gospel, confessed Christ; and Lord's day I immersed him into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. I hope and earnestly pray and trust that he may prove a faithful and abundantly useful minister of Jesus Christ."

Many of our readers will remember the name of William S. Clarke, with whom in my juvenile days of discussion, I had a debate in Eastport, Me., on the Question, "Will all be saved with an endless salvation?" We made half hour speeches on this question for two days. I have neither time, room, nor inclination to say much in reference to that discussion now, more than that he left the impression on our minds at that time, that he was an ultraist of the BALLOU and BALFOUR stamp. Soon after the discussion with me, he had a controversy with the editor of the Christian Investigator. As I was particularly interested in both these discussions, it does not become me now to express an opinion. Well we are much delighted to learn that we are now permitted to hail W. S. C. (not as once we did, "Mr. Clarke, my opponent," but) Brother Clarke, our fellow laborer in the kingdom of Jesus Christ! This is a strange world. Extremes will meet much sooner than those who are only divided by a name.

But to return to Brother Hall's book. We have not yet had time to read more than his examination of the proof texts of Universalism, and to take a glance at the frame work. There are some quaint, out of the way, unrhretorical expressions; but, like the style of our Nova Scotia Sam Slick, perhaps some would see and read facts exhibited in this dress who would not look at a book of a different character. Brother Hall proves himself perfectly familiar with the subject, and is more than a match for all the Universalists in America. If any one doubts this assertion let him read but the *first* section of the book, and meet if he can one of the arguments!

I hope Brother Hall will appoint an agent in Boston, and send on a large lot for the benefit of the head quarters of Universalism, from whom we will try to get a supply for these provinces. W. W. E.

"UNIVERSALISM AGAINST ITSELF.

"Gen. xxii. 18. And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.

"1. Universalists rely upon this text with its parallels, as incontrovertible evidence that the whole human family will finally be made holy and happy. The assumption that promises of a universal or general character are *absolute* or *unconditional*, form the bone and sinew of Universalism; and let it once be made to surrender this ground, and nine tenths of its fortifications have fallen before the artillery of truth. With the reader's indulgence, we shall examine this subject thoroughly; and demonstrate that Universalism, as based upon the assumption of unconditional promises, has no foundation in the word of God, and like the splendid edifice erected upon the sand, must totter and fall to ruins.

"2. The whole force of the argument depends upon the word *shall*: 'In thy seed *shall* all the nations of the earth be blessed.' Universalists assume that it is unconditional, because no condition is here expressed. But we shall now prove beyond successful controversy that many of the

promises and threatenings of the bible are conditional, and depend upon the actions of men for their accomplishment, when the condition *is not expressed*, but merely implied. But previous to this, we lay down an important rule of interpretation, without which no man can shield the bible from numerous contradictions, and from an ignorance of which, have originated nearly all the false doctrines in christendom; and many, (especially among the Universalists) from an ignorance of this *rule*, have turned avowed infidels, and denied in toto the authenticity of the bible. The rule is this: *that a condition being expressed in any part of the bible respect to any promise or threat, that condition must be understood as implied, in all other places where that promise or threat is recorded, if not there expressed!* With this rule before us, we shall now examine some of the threats and promises of the bible.

“3. ‘And Jonah began to enter into the city a day’s journey, and he cried and said: yet forty days, and Nineveh *shall* be overthrown.’ (Jonah iii. 4.) Here is no condition expressed. It is not said: ‘Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown,’ *if* they do not repent. But did not the Ninevites so understand it? Read the next verse: ‘So the people of Nineveh *believed* God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them.’ Now if the people of Nineveh *believed* God, as it is here declared, why did they repent in sackcloth, unless they understood that there was a condition implied in this threat? and that they might by repentance escape the threatened judgment? Why did they not coolly submit to their fate,—await the forty days, and be destroyed, without exerting themselves in the manner they did? The response of all must be: it was because they understood that there was a condition *implied* in that threat. But was their understanding of that matter correct? Read on. ‘And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way, and God repented of the evil *he said he would do* unto them, and *he did it not.*’ (verse 10.) Now Universalists have to take one of three grounds: either 1. That God told the Ninevites a positive falsehood: or 2. That the Ninevites were actually destroyed in forty days, and thus flatly contradict the bible: or 3. That there was a condition implied in that threat. The former two they dare not assert: hence the latter they are compelled to admit, which lays the axe at the very root of Universalism.

“4. ‘Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith: I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father should walk before me forever; [no condition expressed here] but now the Lord saith: be it far from me; [to perform this promise] for them that honor me, I will honor; and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.’ (1 Sam. ii. 30.) Thus, notwithstanding God had promised, without expressing any condition, that the house of Eli, and the house of his father should walk before him forever; but because they refused to honor him, by the contempt with which they had treated his ordinances, and thus did not perform the condition *implied* in this promise;—therefore the Lord reversed the matter, and instead of continuing to confer upon them the honors of sacerdotal dignity, brought upon them shame and confusion of face.

“5. ‘Then said David: O Lord God of Israel, thy servant hath certainly heard that Saul seeketh to come to Keilah to destroy the city for

my sake. Will the men of Keilah deliver me up into his hand? will Saul come down as thy servant hath heard? O Lord God of Israel, I beseech thee, tell thy servant. And the Lord said: *he will come down.* [No condition expressed.] Then said David: will the men of Keilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Saul? And the Lord said: *they will deliver thee up.* [No *if* in the case expressed.] Then David and his men, which were about six hundred, arose and departed out of Keilah,—and it was told Saul that David was escaped from Keilah, and *he forbore to go forth.* (1 Sam. xxiii. 10–13.) Here again we have Universalists in a tight place. According to their doctrine, Saul *did* come down; and the men of Keilah *did* deliver David and his men into the hand of Saul; because there was no condition expressed, and they tell us there can be none implied. Hence the bible is false, and David was killed by Saul in Keilah, notwithstanding he reigned King over Israel many years after Saul was dead. When God said, in reply to the requests of David: *Saul will come down*; and the men of Keilah will *deliver thee up*; it was implied: *if* you continue in the city. This the sequel proves; for David left the city, and consequently Saul did not come down, neither was David delivered into his hands. Universalists are compelled to acknowledge one position, or deny the truth of the bible, or in the third place, take the ground that the Almighty told David a wilful falsehood.

“ 6. We have another most striking evidence of the conditionality of divine promises when the condition is only implied; and that too in the case of Abraham. We can thus let one promise to Abraham explain another. To this none will object. ‘And he said unto Abram: know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred years,—but in the fourth generation they shall come hither again.’ (Gen. xv. 13–16.) This promise is without an expressed condition; and has just as much appearance of *absoluteness*, as the one under examination upon which Universalism is based. I can fancy I hear the Jews, as they were travelling through the wilderness,—those disobedient fellows who were tainted with Universalism,—debating with Moses and Aaron, and reasoning thus: ‘Surely we shall all be brought safely into the land of Canaan without the loss of one. This is as sure, and as firm, and as unalterably fixed as the pillars of heaven. For God swear to our Father Abraham, that after his seed had sojourned in the land of Egypt four hundred years, they should be brought again into this land; and there was no *if* in the case: hence it is unconditional. Mark the positive, absolute manner in which it is expressed. ‘In the fourth generation they SHALL *come hither again* ;’ and who dare call in question the oath of Jehovah? Therefore ye men of Israel, although it would be better to walk in the commandments of God, yet you need have no fears with reference to that goodly land: the oath of Jehovah cannot be broken; and though you lie, steal, commit fornication, and bow down to other gods, and worship images made with your own hands: still you are perfectly safe, as far as the land of Canaan is concerned; for *that*, be it remembered, depends alone upon the unconditional promise to Abraham. God, you recollect, confirmed the same thing to us when we were eating the

passover: 'It shall come to pass, when ye be come to the land which the Lord *will give you, according as he has promised.*' (Exod. xii. 25.) What need we of farther witness? God says he *will* give us the land of Canaan, according as he has *promised.* No condition here neither: hence it will be certainly ours; notwithstanding these partialists, Moses and Aaron, are continually limiting the Holy One of Israel, and teaching the absurd and cruel dogma, that our finite offences will frustrate the purposes of God, and that on account of our sins, we shall die in the wilderness, and fail to reach the promised land. This is too preposterous to be believed, and hence there is no need of getting alarmed, for such monstrous absurdities are only got up to frighten and gull the ignorant.' *This, reader, would no doubt have been good logic then, and a fac simile of the logic of Modern Universalism.*

"7. This kind of reasoning in the abstract, has some appearance of plausibility we admit: yet the Lord has replied to all such logic, and the difficulty we think, is satisfactorily disposed of. Let us now hear what he had to say: 'As truly as I live, saith the Lord,—your carcasses shall fall in the wilderness, and all that were numbered of you, according to your whole number, from twenty years old and upwards, which have murmured against me, doubtless *ye shall not come into the land concerning which I swear to make you dwell therein, save Caleb the son of Jephunneh, and Joshua the son of Nun.* After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year shall you bear your iniquities, even forty years, and ye shall know my BREACH OF PROMISE,—in this wilderness they shall be consumed, and there they shall die.' (Num. xiv. 28–35.) This settles the controversy with Universalism, as based upon the assumption of absolute promises. Though God had made a promise to bring the posterity of Abraham into the land of Canaan, and had confirmed it with an oath, giving it all the appearance of *absoluteness* which can be attached to the proof-text under examination; yet, notwithstanding all this, the Jews by their unbelief and consequent disobedience, caused God to break that promise, and their carcasses fell in the wilderness: and Paul says, 'They could not enter in, because of unbelief.' (Heb. iii. 19.) It was not because God was unwilling to bring them in, but it was their own disobedience which caused the '*breach of promise.*' Had we no other proofs to offer upon this subject, the way the matter now stands, we would have ninety nine probabilities out of a hundred, in favor of our position, and against Universalism. This however is but a tithe of the evidence we have to offer.

"8. 'At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then *I will repent of the good* wherewith *I said I would benefit them.*' (Jer. xviii. 9, 10.) Now suppose we admit the text under examination, to be a promise of universal salvation, what would it avail Universalism, since God has most distinctly declared: 'If they do evil in my sight, that they obey not my voice, *then will I repent of the good, [universal salvation] wherewith I said I would BENEFIT them.*' Just as certain as God has promised salvation in heaven to any body, just so certain they may forfeit this *good*, wherewith God has said he would benefit them. Here then Universalists have met with a Waterloo

defeat; and the only chance now left them, is to cry for quarters;—or if they are still determined to fight, let them deny that God has ever promised salvation in heaven to any body; (for we have seen that as certain as heaven is promised, so certain it may be forfeited by disobedience) but take the ground, that all will be universally saved by *chance*! They can build as good an argument in favor of this position as the other, and get just as much scripture to sustain it; i. e. none at all!

“ 9 Once more: ‘When I say to the righteous that he *shall surely live*; (this is expressed in language even stronger than the promise to Abraham) *if* he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered, but for his iniquity that he hath committed, *he shall die for it*. Again, when I say to the wicked, *thou shalt SURELY die*; (Universalists would say, this *surely* is unconditional) *if* he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right, —he *shall surely live, he shall not die*.’ (Ezek. xxxiii. 13–15.) ‘There are two things in connexion with this subject unaccountably strange. The first is: that the prophets should be so exceedingly minute and particular, in teaching the opposite of Universalism; and be so definite in stating and reiterating principles, which so pointedly subvert and uproot its very foundation. The second is: that the system of Universalism should ever have found a location in the cranium of any man of sense, and be defended as if divinely sanctioned. The testimony of the prophets, as above quoted, is most pointed and emphatic against this doctrine. Suppose Universalists should find a text, which declared in so many words ‘the whole human family *shall surely be saved*,’ still it would not prove Universalism, unless it could be demonstrated that the *whole human family*, without exception, does that which is *lawful and right*: for we can turn over to Ezekiel, where the Lord has once for all, and forever put an end to all-controversy upon this subject,—and where he has given us a clear, and most explicit explanation of all such promises. He there informs us, that though he should declare in language the most emphatic, that the *whole human family shall SURELY be saved*; yet if they should commit iniquity, and refuse to do that which is lawful and right, they *shall SURELY be damned, they shall not be saved*! From this we learn, that there *cannot* be such a thing as an *absolute* or *unconditional* promise, involving the happiness of man. God here informs us, that though he should make the most *positive* promise, without expressing or even intimating a condition, still there would be a condition *implied*; and it would depend upon the lawful, and righteous conduct of men for its fulfilment? Here then is Universalism transposed to the core. The quintessence of its very existence is destroyed; and this one declaration of scripture without the assistance of any other, fastens a mill-stone about its neck, and swings it overboard into the bottom of the sea. Sufficient has now been said, we think, to dispose of Universalism as based upon the assumption of absolute promises in general: yet it may be necessary to be a little more particular, and adduce a few more testimonies with respect to the promise at the head of this article.

“ 10. Some deference at least, should be paid to the views entertained by the *apostles* concerning this promise. We shall first hear the opinion of Peter, as he was honored with the keys of the kingdom of heaven. In

a very notable discourse, delivered by him in Solomon's porch, before a large audience of the Jews, he declares: 'Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. [Unconditionally? No.] Unto you first, God having raised up his son Jesus, *sent him to bless you*, [How?] *in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.*' (Acts iii. 25, 26.) Now I have no objection to all men being saved, providing they all submit to be turned away from their iniquities. Peter here declares most positively, that they cannot be *blessed*, according to the promise made to Abraham, unless Christ does turn them away from their iniquities. And this he is to do *here*, by his *first* mission. [Mark the language.] 'God having raised up his son Jesus, *SENT him to bless you*;' not, *will send him to bless you* at the resurrection! But did Peter tell them in that discourse, what plan Christ had appointed, in order to turn them away from their iniquities? He certainly did. '*Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out,*' [verse 19,] or, [which is precisely the same] that you may be *turned away from your iniquities.* From this testimony it is incontrovertibly established, [if Peter understood the subject correctly,] that the *blessing* promised in the seed of Abraham, is forgiveness of sins, to be enjoyed by '*all nations*' in this life, and is suspended upon the conditions of *repentance* and *conversion*!! This utterly excludes Universalism from the kingdom of Heaven; for Peter, having the keys of that kingdom, has forever locked the door against it.

" 11. We shall next hear the testimony of Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, and plenipotentiary minister of Jesus Christ. Universalists will certainly not object to his testimony; for they claim him to be a regular Universalist preacher. But let us hear what he says: 'When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swear by himself,—that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, *we might have strong consolation who have FLED for refuge to LAY HOLD on the hope set before us.*' (Heb. vi. 13, 18.) From this we discover, that the *consolation*, or the *blessing* included in the promise to Abraham, was for those only who *fled for refuge*, and who *laid hold on the hope set before them* in the gospel. Thus Paul's explanation of this promise, so far from favoring the incongruous theory of Universalism, leaves the old ship BALLOU without helm, anchor, or rudder, to plough its way towards its unconditional harbor with TEKEL inscribed in large capitals upon every sail. But let us hear this apostle again: 'The scriptures foreseeing that God would *justify* the heathen *through faith*, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying: in thee shall all nations be *blessed.*' (Gal. iii. 8.) According to this, the *blessing* referred to in the promise to Abraham, was nothing more nor less than *justification by faith*. If this be not true, then Paul did not understand the subject correctly; and if it be true, then three things must follow: 1. That the promise to Abraham is conditional. 2. That all who are not of *faith* have no share in the blessing promised. And 3. That Paul was not a Universalist. In order now to determine whether we have correctly understood the apostle's view of this subject, we ask him this definite question: Who are to participate in the *blessing* promised to Abraham?

He answers. 'They which be *of faith*, are *blessed* with faithful Abraham,' (verse 9.) In verse 29th, he adds: 'If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and *heirs* according to the *promise*.' Who are Christ's? Ans. 'They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.' (Gal. v. 24.) Heirship *according to the promise* we discover from this to be conditional. None are heirs, except those who are children; for Paul says: 'If *children*, then *heirs*.' (Rom. viii. 17.) Let us now inquire if becoming *children of God*, and *children of Abraham*, is conditional; for, [mark it!] upon this is suspended *heirship* 'according to the *promise*.' If we become children of God, and children of Abraham *conditionally*; then we become *heirs* according to the *promise, conditionally*: and consequently the *blessing* included in the *promise* to Abraham is not *absolute*, or *unconditional*, as Universalists so dogmatically assert. Let us see: 'We are all the *children, of God, by faith* in Christ Jesus.' (Gal. iii. 26.) 'Know ye therefore, that they which are *of faith*, the same are the *children of Abraham*.' (Gal. iii. 7.) The whole matter now stands thus: [Paul's view of the subject being correct.] 1. We cannot be heirs, according to the promise made to Abraham, unless we belong to Christ the seed of Abraham; and we cannot be Christ's unless we crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts. 2. We cannot be heirs of the *blessing promised* to Abraham—the *unsearchable riches* of Christ, unless we are *children*; and none can be children, only those who '*are of faith*;' and hence the argument in favor of the *conditionality* of the *promise* to Abraham, is put beyond the reach of controversy. Peter's explanation, as we have seen, left Universalism dead; but Paul's leaves the doctrine *twice* dead, and plucked up by the roots!

"12. In conclusion upon this promise, we present *Universalism against itself*. Universalists contend that *all nations*, must mean the *whole human family*, without exception. All we have to do now, to make Universalism commit suicide, is to read another text with their own definition. 'When the son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered *all nations*, [that is: the entire posterity of Adam] and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.' (Math. xxv. 31, 32.) Query: Was the whole human family arraigned before Titus at the destruction of Jerusalem? Were Universalists present on that occasion? If not, then the coming of the Lord is yet future, themselves being judges. We therefore speak within bounds, when we say that UNIVERSALISM IS AGAINST ITSELF, and virtually renounced by its advocates, whenever this text is summoned to its support."

REMARKS ON QUERY ON BAPTISM FOR REMISSION OF SINS— *Concluded.*

5. As to Cornelius and his household, I would briefly remark that Peter did preach baptism for remission when he said "to him give all the prophets witness, that *through his name*, whosoever *believeth* on him shall receive the remission of sins." Acts x. 43. What does the Apostle mean by the *name* of the Lord? When did they have called over them

his name but in their baptism? They proclaimed remission in his *name*. "Repent and be baptized in the *name* of the Lord." "Ye are washed, sanctified and justified in the *name* of the Lord." Peter was to tell Cornelius what he should do: he was to tell him words by which he and his house were to be saved. The first words addressed directly to Cornelius, as a command, were Be baptized in the name of the Lord. The baptism of the Holy Spirit, which Cornelius and his household received previous to baptism, was not to make disciples of them, but to convince Peter and particularly the Jewish brethren that accompanied him, that God was just as willing to receive a Gentile into his kingdom as a Jew. "He gave them the like gift as he did unto us," said Peter, referring to the day of Pentecost. If the like gift, it could not be for an absolutely different purpose. The Spirit was given to the Church on the day of Pentecost, not to make them disciples, but to convince the unbelieving. "Tongues are for a sign, not for those who believe, but for those that believe not." Jews and Gentiles came into the kingdom in the same way. Though the father ran out of the house to receive the returning long-lost Gentiles, it is no proof that they were in the Church of the Lord, engraft into Christ, until they were baptized. For the Gentile, Paul said "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ."

We shall always be happy to hear from you, Brother G. May the Lord preserve you a faithful citizen of his kingdom. W. W. R.

STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

No. 7.

PREFATORY HINTS TO THE OTHER EPISTLES.

BY A CAMPBELL.

THESE hints do not constitute any thing like Prefaces to the Epistles; but, in subordination to the principles suggested in the general preface, may be of some use to the studious reader of this volume.

PAUL'S TWO LETTERS TO THE CORINTHIANS.

1. In Acts xviii. we have a history of the conversion of the Corinthians, and Paul's residence among them.

2. It appears from this history, and from the first letter, that the congregations in Corinth was composed of Jews and Gentiles, and that the greater number were Gentiles.

3. From the Epistle itself it may be learned, as well as from extrinsic sources of information, that the Corinthians paid great respect to the wisdom of the philosophers, and to the eloquence of their rhetoricians, and that in their morals they were a very dissolute and licentious people. Such was the common reputation of the Corinthians before their calling.

4. It is also evident that there were schisms in that congregation, occasioned by one or more factious persons of Sadducean principles, and admirers of Pagan philosophy, who attempted to rival the Apostle in the affection and veneration of the members of the congregation.

5. That these factious leaders had succeeded in part; yet still there remained a number unmoved from their attachment to the Apostle, and confidence in him.

6. That a letter had been written by these to the Apostle, acquainting

him with their situation, and soliciting information from him on certain topics.

From these *circumstances* of this congregation, and from the exhortation of the Apostle, it is very apparent that his chief *design* in writing the first letter, was to support his own authority, dignity, and reputation ; to vindicate himself from the aspersions and calumnies of the factious ; and to diminish the credit and influence of those aspiring demagogues and leaders, by exhibiting their errors and miscarriages ; and thus to withdraw from them the respect and admiration of the party they had formed. To these topics he confines himself to the end of the sixth chapter ; and, occasionally, when discussing other topics, he aims a blow at the factionists, to the end of the letter.

In managing this controversy he is very dexterous. He shews all that philosophy and rhetoric could achieve, from a fair statement of what they had achieved ; and proves, beyond all doubt, that without a *verbal revelation* from God, the philosopher and rhetorician must have continued in the dark with regard to the knowledge of God. He takes their own reproachful terms uttered against him, his mission, and doctrine, and glories in them ; in what they called the foolishness of proclaiming life through a crucified person. In this way he draws off the affection of the people, who had renounced Paganism, from those leaders who extolled themselves, by exhibiting their attainments in the philosophy of the Greeks.

He then adverts to the disorders in this congregation, which he imputes to these leaders, and shews that the immoralities in members of this community were, in a certain way, chargeable to these factious persons ; and proves, beyond all doubt, that a divided people are generally a corrupt people ; or, at least, that vicious practices are either the result or concomitants of schisms and factions.

The principal items in the subsequent part of the first letter are so easily distinguished, and so different from each other, that, in the paragraphs in which they are presented in this version, they are marked with sufficient plainness. He treats, successively, on the incompatibility of lawsuits amongst Christians ; on married and single life ; on the eating of meats offered to idols ; on his call, mission, right, and authority as an Apostle. He lays before them the fate of the fathers of the nation, who while they professed subordination to, and were participants of, the ordinances of that worship, were not upright before God ; but, in fact, rebels against his authority. He next censures their departure from the meaning and design of one of the Christian institutes, viz. the Lord's Supper ; treats of spiritual gifts ; disproves the Sadducean hypothesis, and removes objections adduced against the resurrection of the dead and concludes with directions for collections for the poor saints in Jerusalem, with exhortations and salutations.

Having tested his *power* in Corinth by the first letter, and hearing of its success from Titus, he takes courage, writes a second letter, speaks more boldly of himself, and deals more severely and sharply with his opponents. In this he aims at the extermination of the faction, which he had attacked and weakened in his first letter. He makes good all his claims to the respect, veneration, and submission, of the Corinthians ; strips his antagonists of every pretext : and, by the most pathetic recital

of his own history, and exhortations to unity and peace, closes his communications to this large and eminent congregation.

GALATIANS.

The design of this letter is pretty similar to that of the epistle to the Romans; but directed more to a certain class of Judaizers, who aimed at bringing the congregations in Galatia under the law. It is not so comprehensive as the letter to the Romans; but much fuller on one or two topics engrossed in that epistle. Having been the founder of these congregations in Galatia, he adopts a style quite different from that used in the epistle to the Romans, and speaks more in the style of a teacher to his own pupils. The gifts which the Holy Spirit conferred by his hands, the covenant with Abraham, the law at Sinai, the promise of Canaan, are the principal topics from which the Apostle Paul argues in this letter.

[FOR THE CHRISTIAN.]

BROTHER EDITOR—In perusing the number for last month, I find a person by the name of "Condono" passing an unjust remark, viz. that the sinner could not be justified by faith alone. Surely Mr. "Condono" will not deny, but that all things are possible with God. If he was to look over the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of the New Testament, he will find a great number of scriptures testifying that there are men in the holy book of God that have been justified by faith alone in Christ Jesus. For instance, that good apostle St. Paul, who when he was going to Damascus for the express purpose of persecuting the Church of Christ, when a light shining from heaven round about him, and falling to the earth, hearing a voice but seeing no man, what was his reply, "Who art thou, Lord! Lord, what wilt thou have me to do!" Here was faith alone. Notice Romans i. 17, "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith, to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith;" also chap. iii. 28, "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of law." In 4th chap. Abraham was justified by faith; again, in chap. v. 1, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Gall. ii. 16, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Again, in Ephesians ii. 8, 9, "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast." Numerous other portions of Holy Writ might be found, to prove that in all ages that are past the sinner has been, is, and will be justified by faith ALONE in Christ Jesus. We all know that the blessed Lord in the days of his flesh employed various means in converting the poor sinner. For instance, the thief on the cross; who before, through all probability, never received the means of grace, when he said "Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, verily I say unto thee, this day shalt thou be with in paradise." So you perceive a man that was sanctioned for execution,

and no doubt the vilest of characters, must necessarily have been saved with an everlasting salvation (by faith alone). The second dogma, as he terms it, (what I call the truth of holy writ) is the utter depravity of the sinner. Take a glance at Jeremiah xvii. 9, "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked: who can know it?" Here is depravity. The heart is here characterized—first, as deceitful, and that above or in all things; secondly, as desperately wicked: in so dangerous, so deplorable a state, as is not to be found out—who can know it? The word in the original, which we translate desperately wicked, signifies a mortal incurable disease—a disease which, seizing on the vitals, affects and threatens the whole frame, and which no remedy can reach. If we look back at our first parents' transgression, whereby man, departing from God, fatally destroyed his soul's health, and sunk into that state so pathetically described by Isaiah, chap. i., 'The whole head is sick; all the powers of the understanding disordered; and the whole heart faint; all the springs of the affections enfeebled; from the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it; but wounds, bruises, and putrifying sores: a depraved nature, guilt, sorrow and death extend to all its posterity; the evil growing worse continually, and no help or helper at hand, they have not been closed, nor bound up, nor mollified with ointment. In consequence of this deep-rooted, depraved nature, the heart is deceitful; that is, it deceives us and fails us in every attempt. The prowess of the Romans established altars to fear and paleness: so deeply were they infatuated, so totally lost to common sense, that the apostle Paul's worst enemies could find no more plausible accusation against him in one of the politest cities then in the world, than that he had ventured to affirm they were no gods who were made with hands. And even the great apostle declares in the 7th chapter of Romans, "For I know that in me (that is in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing, for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not;" and so on. You see the apostle Paul declares his utter depravity in the flesh. What must then the sinner be? I ask Mr. "Condono" to examine these few portions of Holy Scripture, wherein he will find his utter depravity, unless quickened by God's faith and grace. Perhaps, Brother Editor, will be kind enough to find a small space in *The Christian* for these few lines; likewise his own views on this subject would be highly appreciated by

AN ANXIOUS INQUIRING SUBSCRIBER.

St. John, June 12, 1847.

REPLY TO AN ANXIOUS INQUIRING SUBSCRIBER.

My Dear Sir,—I have within a few minutes received your note of the 19th instant, disclosing your real name. I shall immediately place your manuscript into the printer's hands. Those who have read "Mr. Condono's" strictures on the articles of the evangelical alliance shall also have the benefit of your criticisms. You express a desire that I too, should give my views of justification by faith alone; and the doctrine of "utter depravity" of the sinner.

In reference to the former doctrine, I conceive it wholly unnecessary to make a remark after what has already been published in *The Chris-*

tian. Until the arguments submitted in the *May* number, on pages 67, and 77, are carefully examined and shown to be unsubstantiated by the Oracles of God, I must be excused occupying any space to show that the doctrine of justification by faith alone has been weighed in the balances of the sanctuary and found wanting; but "Condono" is of age, he can speak for himself if he thinks your remarks on the subject worthy of notice. He will see the necessity of being very brief, as our pages are few.

The doctrine of the "utter depravity" of the sinner has called forth many books and sermons, and much controversy, without any thing definite. Many controversialists would grasp each other by the hand, and in theory would be brothers, were they to pause and explain the meaning of the words in reference to which they were about to hold a discussion! You say you believe that the sinner is "*entirely depraved.*" This may or may not be true according to the meaning attached to the terms 'utter' and "depravity." If by them you mean to express your belief that the sinner is entirely cut off from spiritual connexion with God—that he is dead in trespasses and sins—and that without the regenerating influences of the Gospel he must perish everlastingly, I will agree with you: but if you mean that what the words "utter" and "depravity" seem to imply, that every sinner is as bad—as corrupt as it is possible for him to be, I hesitate before I give in my adhesion to such a doctrine. For "wicked men and seducers wax worse and worse," and hence not totally depraved, I presume. I charitably hope that few sinners are as bad as the arch adversary of our race. But some mean by the phrase total depravity, that all a sinner's moral powers are as indisposed to the reception of truth and the obedience of faith, as were the physical powers of Lazarus when he had been *four* days entombed. Nay, some of our modern "divines" say that they differ from Lazarus *only*, in that they are not only dead to all the calls, invitations and motives of the Gospel, but with all their powers they are striving against the Lord, until the Holy Spirit regenerates them by his direct almighty power. Now if this be your definition of *utter depravity*, I hope you will review the grounds of your faith, for I strongly suspect you did not receive your views from the Word of God.

I think, sir, you have not given the principles advocated in *The Christian* a careful examination. I must inform you that there are many thousands in Europe and America who are toiling night and day to induce their fellow men to return to the oracles of God. They wish to sustain no party but that party which the word of God sustains. They wish to see all Christians united. A Christian with them is one who believes in Jesus Christ, and obeys him in all things. They wish to promote *christian* union. They have learned from the New Testament that the first disciples were of "one heart and of one mind." What has been, they think might be again. And to accomplish this they agree to speak of Bible things—the doctrine they would inculcate, and the practices they desire should obtain among the followers of the Lamb—in the language of the word of God. They presume not to coin any new terms to express the doctrine of the Lord. They ask no man to believe what they cannot inculcate with a *thus saith the word of the Lord.*

They ask no man to practice that which they cannot commend in the express words of the Holy Spirit.

Bringing your two doctrines to this test, they are found sadly wanting. Salvation or justification by faith *alone* is not in the record! And utter depravity is not found in the word of God. If it were a doctrine of the bible, we should no doubt find it in so many words. But I am inclined to think brother "Condono" meant simply to oppose that doctrine which teaches that a sinner is unable to believe and obey the gospel until regenerated by the Spirit. Believing as we do that the faith and obedience of the gospel are necessary in order to regeneration, he could not but oppose that system that makes the word of God of no effect.

W. W. E.

A SUPPOSED EVIDENCE NO EVIDENCE.

It is a common opinion among modern professors, that if a person confesses on a death bed their willingness to die, that such a confession is evidence of their preparation for death. In the examination of this subject, I will produce only one testimony from the unerring standard of divine truth to show that an unwillingness to die is no part of a want of preparation. The word of the Lord that came to Hezekiah by Isaiah, the prophet, saying, "Set thine house in order for thou shalt die and not live." Here I will observe the King had no preparation to make respecting his spiritual condition. This was already done. But was he willing to die? No! he prayed to the Lord, and in his prayer he calls upon the Lord to "remember how he had walked before him *in truth, and with a perfect heart, and have done good in thy sight.*" There we see he appeals to the Lord that he had *walked in truth*, and possessed a heart corresponding thereunto, and his works were of the right kind, such as pleased God. I wonder if we could find among those who are willing to die, more or even as much personal holiness as good old Hezekiah possessed; yet with all his piety he was not willing to die. Then to this rule respecting the evidence, there is at least one exception. I think brother Eaton, you might write a little that would be interesting on this subject.

CONDONO.

"OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY."

THERE is a sore evil existing in our land, and it has a very bad effect by reason of the source from which it proceeds. It is a disregard for "Lord's day," and that too among the professed friends of the Redeemer. The first start of this disregard of the Lord's day, I have observed is, 1st. A neglect to attend the services of the Lord's house. 2d. A neglect of family worship. 3d. A neglect of private devotion. 4th. A neglect of reading the Bible. 5th. Idle conversation upon worldly business on the Lord's day. 6th. The next step (if he be owner of a fishing vessel) is to spend that day in gratifying a sordid lust to accumulate a certain portion of this world's goods. And the non-professor beholds with astonishment the conduct of such professors, by which he is emboldened to do the same. And another class of professors employ the Lord's day in paying visits. How unseemly it looks to

see professors of religion leaving the services of the Lord, and immediately turning to the service of Satan, in babbling about their neighbour's dishonesty, and telling how many cod fish they have taken, and how many boxes of smoked herrings they put up, and how fast their vessels can sail, and a thousand other things. And there is another thing attached to this great evil, and that is, buying and selling on the Lord's day; and another performance, still worse, if any thing, than what I have before stated, and that is to repair to the Meeting house as though they intended to serve the Lord, and there (to their shame be it spoken) buy cattle, or offer them for sale, and that too, to non-professors of religion. Alas! what an example for a Christian to set before the world. These things, brother Eaton, are facts that have come under my own observation. "Tell it not in Gath, nor publish it in Askelon." Yet it must be told.

CONDONO.

REMARKS.

Friend "Condono" has certainly fallen upon evil times. He must surely be looking on the dark side of the picture. A faithful proclaimer of the apostolic gospel ought to cure these evils. An exhibition of the transcendent blessings procured by the death and resurrection of the Lord Messiah ought to excite in the minds of this community other emotions. These persons cannot certainly be practical believers in the ancient gospel. They must belong to those who have received another gospel which we have not preached.

We have for some time doubted the propriety of publishing C's strictures, as they appeared to have a local or rather personal bearing. But on more mature reflection we thought perhaps some of these worldly professors might see his remarks, and be induced to turn from the error of their ways.

W. W. E.

RELIGIOUS MAXIMS.—BY UPHAM.

XII.

IN proportion as the heart becomes sanctified, there is a diminished tendency to enthusiasm and fanaticism. And this is undoubtedly one of the leading tests of sanctification. One of the marks of an enthusiastic and fanatical state of mind, is a fiery and unrestrained impetuosity of feeling; a rushing on sometimes very blindly, as if the world were in danger, or as if the great Creator was not at the helm. It is not only feeling without a good degree of judgment, but, what is the corrupting and fatal trait, it is feeling without a due degree of confidence in God. True holiness reflects the image of God in this respect as well as in others, that it is calm, thoughtful, deliberative, inimitable. And how can it be otherwise, since, rejecting its own wisdom and strength, it incorporates into itself the wisdom and strength of the Almighty?

XIII.

The hidden life, which God imparts to his accepted people, may flourish in solitudes and deserts, far from the societies of men and the din and disturbance of cities. From the cave of the hermit, from the cell of the solitary recluse, the fervent prayer has often arisen, which has been acceptable in the sight of God. But it would be a strange and

fatal misconception, that religion, even in its most pure and triumphant exaltations, can flourish nowhere else. The home of holiness is in the heart, irrespective of outward situations and alliances; therefore we may expect to find it, if there are hearts adapted to its reception and growth, in the haunts of business as well as in the silence of retirement; in the palaces of Rome as well as in the deserts of the Thebais. It is a fatal mistake to suppose that we cannot be holy except on the condition of a situation and circumstances in life such as shall suit ourselves. It is one of the first principles of holiness to have our times and our places, our going out and coming in, our wasted and our goodly heritage entirely with the Lord. Here O Lord hast thou placed us, and we will glorify thee here.

XIV.

In the agitations of the present life, beset and perplexed as we are with troubles, how natural it is to seek earnestly some place of rest! And hence it is that we so often reveal our cares and perplexities to our fellow men, and seek comfort and support from that source. But the sanctified soul, having experienced the uncertainties of all human aids, turns instinctively to the great God; and hiding itself in the presence and protection of the divine existence, it reposes there, as in a strong tower which no enemies can conquer, and as an everlasting rock which no floods can wash away. It knows the instructive import of that sublime proclamation of the Psalmist, lxii. 5, "My soul wait thou ONLY upon God; for my expectation is from him."

XV.

Speak not often of your own actions, nor ever, when it can be properly avoided, make any allusion to yourself, as an agent in transactions which are calculated to attract notice. We do not suppose, as some may be inclined to do, that frequent speaking of our actions is necessarily a proof, although it may furnish a presumption, of inordinate self love or vanity; but it cannot be denied that by such a course we expose ourselves to temptations and dangers in that direction. It is much safer, and is certainly much more profitable, to speak of what has been done for us and wrought in us,—to speak, for instance, of ourselves as the receipts of the goodness of God,—than to speak of what we have ourselves done. But even here, also, although it may often be an imperative duty, there is need of deliberation and caution.

OUR ADDRESS.—If our brethren and friends in the United States will please attend to our frequent remarks on this subject, they will do us a great favour. Write on all papers, exchanges, &c., "*The Christian*," Eastport, Me., NOTHING ELSE.

A few more subscribers can be supplied with full sets of vols. 1, 2, and 3.

* * * "THE CHRISTIAN."—A monthly of sixteen pages, at ONLY *Half a dollar a year*, in advance. All subscribers to begin with the volume. Letters, papers, &c. from Canada and the United States, sent to Eastport, Me. From all other places, to Saint John, N. B.